DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 439 EC 120 278

AUTHOR Smith, Carl R.; And Others
TITLE Reintegration of Emotionally Disabled Pupils. Iowa Study: Preliminary Report.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des Moines. Div. of Special Education.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotionally Disturbed; Exceptional Child Research; *Mainstreaming; *Special Education Teachers; *Special Programs; *Student Placement; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS Iowa

ABSTRACT

To determine how many emotionally disturbed (ED) Iowa students were reintegrated into regular classrooms, by what criteria, and by whom, a study of ED teachers from 76 public school programs serving this population was undertaken. Results of the questionnaire showed that 85.5% of respondents worked in school districts with over 3,000 students, 76.4% had been teaching 3 years or less, 67.1% worked in self-contained (or self-contained, severe) classrooms, and the majority of students were in elementary school. Other findings revealed that 84.2% of the respondents indicated that no students had been referred to a less restrictive ED programing during the 1977-78 school year, and that the likelihood of a particular pupil being integrated decreases in relation to the length of time the pupil has been in the ED program. It was shown that readiness of a student to return to a regular classroom rests with the perceptions of the individual ED teacher regarding the student's progress and that 65.5% of the respondents felt that integration procedures were not clearly defined. In selecting the regular classroom or teacher to be involved in the integration process most repondents indicated that humane, attitudinal, and personality factors were more highly valued than knowledge of educational techniques or educational philosophies. The teacher questionnaire is appended. (Author/PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IOWA STUDY: PRELIMINARY REPORT

Reintegration of Emotionally Disabled Pupils

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED176439

EC120278

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carl P. Smith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Special Education Division
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Jolly Ann Davidson, President, Clarinda
John E. van der Linden, Vice-President, Sibley
Cornelius Bodine, Jr., Sioux City
William N. Cropp, Des Moines
Karen K. Goodenow, Wall Lake
Virgina Harper, Fort Madison
Robert G. Koons, Clinton
Susan M. Wilson, Waterloo
(Vacancy)

ADMINISTRATION

Robert D. Benton, State Superintendent, and Executive Officer
of the State Board of Public Instruction
David H. Bechtel, Administrative Assistant
James E. Mitchell, Deputy State Superintendent

Pupil Personnel Services Branch

Drexel D. Lange, Associate Superintendent
J. Frank Vance, Director of Special Education
Carol Bradley, Chief, Special Education Instructional Services
Richard E. Fischer, Chief, Special Education Support Services
John Lanham, Chief, Special Education Programs and Fiscal Services
Jerry D. Brown, Hearing Conservation/Education Services
Tom Burgett, Consultant, Special Education Finance
Joan Clary, Consultant, Preschool Handicapped
Fay S. Cleary, Consultant, School Health Services
Gail Sullivan Fleig, Consultant Special Education Media Services
J. Joseph Freilinger, Consultant, Clinical Speech Services
Jeff Grimes, Consultant, School Psychological Services
John R. Lee, Administrative Assistant
Patricia L. McConkey, Consultant, Mental Disabilities
Merry Maitre, Consultant, Career/Vocational Education for the Handicapped Student
Steve Maurer, Consultant, Serverely & Profoundly Handicapped
James H. Reese, Consultant, Learning Disabilities
Kathy Skinner, Consultant, Special Education Administrative Services
Carl Smith, Consultant, Emotional Disabilities and Chronically Disruptive
Philip Tetzloff, Consultant, Special Education Program Evaluation
Douglas A. West, Consultant, Special Education Professional Development

IOWA STUDY
REINTEGRATION OF EMOTIONALLY DISABLED PUPILS: PRELIMINARY REPORT

Carl R. Smith
Consultant - Emotional Disabilities
and Chronically Disruptive
Iowa Department of Public Instruction

Maureen White
Teacher - Emotional Disabilities
Waterloo, Iowa

Reece Peterson
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

January, 1979

CONTENTS

Introduction 1-6

Procedures 7-9

Results .....

- Background Information 10-12
- Reintegration of Pupils 13-19
- Determining Readiness 20-21
- Planning/Procedures 22-25
- Selection of Integration Site 26-29
- Methods/Follow-up 30-32

Discussion 33-35

References 36-37

Appendix 38-45

INTRODUCTION

This is a preliminary report summarizing data collected directly from teachers of the emotionally disabled in Iowa. This study was conducted in the spring of 1978. This preliminary report deals with the totals, means and standard deviations of the various items included in a questionnaire returned by these teachers. A later report will deal with comparative results based on various groupings of the data as well as the results of statistical treatments of the data.

Throughout this report the reader will note the use of both the terms "integration" and "reintegration". For the purposes of this report, the term reintegration is used when viewing the overall process of a pupil having left the regular classroom, being served in a special class program and later returning to the regular class. In this situation the pupil is actually reintegrating back into the structure of which he/she was originally a part. Integration is used when viewing the child who is already in a special class and is anticipating the return to regular education. Although this report is titled "Reintegration of Emotionally Disabled Pupils", most of the data reported actually refers to the integration component of this overall process.

Review of Related Literature

Lloyd Dunn's (1968) criticism of special class programming led to a professional reexamination of the special class option serving handicapped children. Other researchers (Sparks & Blackman, 1965) had previously questioned the efficacy and outcomes of placing handicapped children in special class options.

Concurrent with the presentation of these professional concerns were legal questions being raised regarding special class placement. Up until the late 1960's and 1970's the school's decision to place a child in a special class had been relatively unquestioned. The prevailing philosophy up until this time is exemplified in the following statement by Reutter and Hamilton (1970):

> Where special classes are organized for pupils who, because of some mental or physical infirmity, are unable to do the amount or quality of work required of the group of which the child in question would normally be a member, school authorities can assign him to a special class. (p. 118)

Several court decisions in the late 1960's and early 1970's brought the professional questions regarding special education class placements into the court system (*Spangler v. Board of Education*, 1970; *Diana v. State Board of Education*, 1970; *Covarrubies v. San Diego Unified School District*, 1971: *Arreola v. Board of Education*, 1968).

Hobson v. Hansen (1967) had previously examined the fairness of the "tracking" system used in the Washington, D.C. Public Schools. Under this system students were given several tests and placed in an honors, general, or special curriculum. According to Judge J. Skelley Wright such a system was a denial of equal educational opportunity to the Black and the poor and was thus in conflict with the fifth and fourteenth constitutional amendments. One of the factors considered by Judge Wright in this decision was the apparent lack of movement of youngsters from the lower track back into either of the two other tracks. According to Judge Wright:

> ...any system of ability grouping which, through failure to include and implement the concept of compensatory education for the disadvantaged child or otherwise, fails in fact to bring the great majority of children into the mainstream of public education denies opportunity and thus encounters the constitutional bar. (p. 515)

Deno (1970) presented the concept of a cascade of special education services which seemed to address many of the legal and professional concerns regarding the special class model. According to Deno's proposal the special class should be but one option to serve handicapped pupils. Other, less restrictive options should include part time special and supplemental instructional services. Applying this model should create a system in which students can move along a continuum of program options according to their particular program needs at any point in time. Such a system should prevent the "dead-end street" found in the *Hobson v. Hansen* (1967) proceedings.

Morse, Cutler and Fink (1964), in nationally surveying programs serving the emotionally disabled student found that one of the factors viewed as indicating a lack of program success was a lack of movement of pupils served back to the regular classroom. Amidst a lack of uniformity in goals and aims in the programs surveyed, fifty-four percent of the administrators surveyed in the study expressed the aim of expediting change in the order to enable such a student to return to the regular classroom.

Rationale for Present Study

At this time the primary data regarding the integration of emotionally disabled students from a special class option into the regular class

option appears to be a description of the manner individual program personnel have chosen to deal with this (Stark & Bentzen, 1971; Stone, 1971). Yet, such a program goal is viewed as essential in this type of special education programming (Grosenick, 1970). Despite the importance of this variable, this writer is unaware of any studies, conducted on a large scale basis, concerning the number of emotionally disabled pupils integrated or the procedures used for such integration.

Some professionals may contend that integration of emotionally disabled pupils is not necessarily one of our primary goals in programming for such pupils. Such professionals may state that our role in providing such programs is to provide a therapeutic milieu in which emotionally disabled youngsters are protected from the rigors afforded youngsters in the regular classroom. Such proponents would also contend that our primary professional goal is to structure individual success within the special classroom which may or may not lead to return to regular education.

It is however, the philosophy of the investigators in this study, that, although there are examples of severely involved emotionally disabled pupils who are reasonably going to be served in self-contained settings over an extended period of time, the majority of pupils who are referred to such a setting will be and should be returned to the regular classroom. This premise is based on the possiblity of constructive behavioral change as well as the legal, professional and moral arguments supporting such a goal.

Rhodes (1977), addressing the issues surrounding the mainstreaming movement in special education states:

> My own assessment of efforts such as mainstreaming, normalizing, deinstitutionalization, litigation, and decategorizing adds up to optimism and hope. I believe we are trying very hard to move beyond the cultural mindtrap of normal-abnormal, particularly within regard to children. However, our movement is intuitive and dreamlike. It is a form of sleep walking. It is as though we know deep inside ourselves what we are moving toward and away from, without a preestablished rational base.(35)

It is the primary purpose of this study to move beyond "intuition" and "dreamlike" movement as described by Rhodes and to gather, directly from teachers of the emotionally disabled in Iowa, data dealing with the following questions:

(1) How many such students are integrated, referred to a more or less restrictive program, or retained in present programs during one school year?

(2) What criteria and methods are employed in the integration process?

(3) Do such programs in Iowa have established procedures for integration?

(4) What professionals are primarily responsible for the integration of such students?

For the purposes of this study the following definitions are used:

Integration - the participation of a special education pupil in any area of regular educational programming in addition to lunch room and playground.

More restrictive program - program characterized by smaller teacher-pupil ratio and less emphasis on inclusion in regular education programming.

Less restrictive program - program characterized by higher pupil-teacher ratio and more emphasis on inclusion in regular education programming.

PROCEDURES

To address the issues surrounding the reintegration of emotionally disabled pupils, Maureen White, a teacher of the emotionally disabled in Waterloo, Iowa, and Carl R. Smith, Consultant in Emotional Disabilities for the Iowa Department of Public Instruction spent eight months designing and field testing an instrument to gather, directly from the teachers of the emotionally disabled, data dealing with the questions specified above.

Description of Subjects

Teachers of the emotionally disabled from 76 public school programs serving this population of handicapped pupils participated in the study. This number represents 79% of the possible pool of 96 such teachers employed in these positions during the 1977-78 school year. These teachers were employed in self-contained or special class with integration models in public school settings. These models are defined, adapted from the *Iowa Rules of Special Education* (1977), as follows:

> *Special class with integration* - an education program for children requiring special education with similar educational needs who are enrolled in a special education classroom but who can profit from participation in one or more academic subjects with pupils who are not handicapped. Weighted index factor is 1.7. Maximum class size for elementary program is 12, for secondary 15.

Self-contained special class - an education program serving pupils with similar special education needs to the degree that they require special education instruction on a full time basis. Weighted index factor is 2.0. Maximum class size is 8 for elementary, 10 for secondary.

Self-contained special class-severe - an educational program serving severely handicapped pupils with similar special education needs to the degree that they require special education instruction on a full time basis. Weighted index factor is 4.2. Maximum class size is 5 for elementary and secondary.

Specifically excluded from the study were (1) teachers of emotionally disabled pupils in residential treatment facilities, (2) teachers of the emotionally disabled in state hospital settings and (3) teachers of the emotionally disabled in resource teaching programs. It was decided not to include these three groups because of the unique factors which may be operating in such programs which are qualitatively distinct from self-contained and special class with integration models operating in public school settings.

Examples of these distinct factors would be as follows. Residential and state hospital programs are operated in a setting outside of the public schools. These programs are often closely tied with the clinical programs in such settings. Decisions to return a child to the public schools are influenced by this clinical orientation.

Categorical resource programs for emotionally disabled pupils are few in number in Iowa. Rather, most such services to emotionally disabled pupils in this model are provided in multi-disability programs. These teachers may or may not have specific training in the area of emotional disabilities. Pupils in these programs spend most of their school time in the regular classroom and are primarily the responsibility of the regular classroom teacher.

Procedure

A questionnaire dealing with the number of pupils served, re-integrated during the 1977-78 school year and factors involved in re-integration was mailed to all potential participants in the spring of 1978. A second questionnaire was mailed to potential participants not responding to the initial questionnaire. A total of 76 or 79% of the possible participants returned the questionnaire and are included in this study.

Following the return of this data Reese Peterson, formerly of Drake University and presently Assistant Professor of Special Education at the University of Nebraska analyzed the data. Following are the results of this analysis.

RESULTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Size of School District

Respondents were asked to designate the school district in which their program operated. For purposes of analysis the school districts were divided into small, medium and large according to the following ranges of 1977-78 district enrollment.

Small - Up to 990 pupils

Medium - 1000-2999 pupils

Large - 3000 or more pupils

This trichotomy is similar to the data collection used by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction. The results indicated:

CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Small	6	7.9
Medium	5	6.6
Large	65	85.5
Total	76	100.0

These results indicate that the vast majority (85.5%) of respondents in this study operate programs in what could be considered the larger (more than 3000 pupils) school districts in Iowa. Yet, only twenty-eight or 6% of the 449 school districts in Iowa were in this category during the 1977-78 school year.

Experience of Teachers

Each respondent was asked to indicate the number of years he/she had been a teacher of the emotionally disabled. Results were as follows:

NUMBER OF YEARS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
0-1	23	30.3
2-3	35	46.1
4-5	8	10.5
6 or more	9	11.8
No Answer	1	1.3
Total	76	100.0

Combining these responses we find 76.4% of the respondents indicating that they had been teaching emotionally disabled pupils for three years or less. These can partially be explained by recognizing the relatively recent development of many of these programs in Iowa (Smith, 1978) and the reported high attrition rate among teachers of these pupils (West, 1977).

Class Models

Each respondent was asked to report the type of special education classroom model he/she operated in the public schools. These models were defined for the respondents as follows:

> *Special class with integration* - an educational program for children requiring special education with similar educational needs who are enrolled in a special education classroom but who can profit from participation in one or more academic subjects with pupils who are not handicapped. Weighted index factor is 1.7. Maximum class size for elementary program is 12, for secondary 15.
>
> *Self-contained special class* - an educational program serving pupils with similar special education needs to the degree that they require special education instruction on a full time basis. Weighted index factor is 2.0. Maximum class size is 8 for elementary, for secondary 10.

Self-contained special class - an educational program serving severely handicapped pupils with similar special education needs tc the degree that they require special education instruction on a full time basis. Weighted index factor is 4.2. Maximum class size is 5 for elementary and secondary.

Classroom models represented in this study were as follows:

MODEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Special class with Integration	25	32.9
Self-Contained	34	44.7
Self-Contained Severe	17	22.4
Total	76	100.0

Combining these categories we find that 67.1% of these respondents worked in self-contained or self-contained severe classrooms.

Program Levels

Respondents were asked to indicate the school placement of students in their E.D. program. These were divided into elementary (K-6), secondary (7-12) or some combination. Results were as follows:

LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Elementary	41	53.9
Secondary	29	38.2
Other	6	7.9
Total	76	100.0

Groupings such as K-9, 5-8 etc. are included under the "other" category. Although not as heavily weighted in the direction of elementary programming as the Morse, Cutler, and Fink (1964) study, more (41) elementary than secondary (29) programs are represented in this study.

REINTEGRATION OF PUPILS

Number of Students served

Each of the respondents was asked the total number of E.D. students he/she had taught during the 1977-78 school year. Results were as follows:

Number of Students	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample	Number of Students	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
2	1	1	13	3	4
3	2	3	14	2	3
4	2	3	15	1	1
5	4	5	16	2	3
6	6	8	17	1	1
7	6	8	18	2	3
8	10	13	20	1	1
9	7	9	21	2	3
10	8	11	27	1	1
11	12	16	33	1	1
12	2	3			

The mean number of students served by these teachers was 10.289. Other results include:

Mode - 11

Standard Deviation - 5.212

Integration

Integration was defined for the participants in this study as, "The participation of a special education pupil in any area of regular educational programming in addition to lunch room and playground."

The respondents were asked to indicate the total number of E.D. students integrated *part-time* from their E.D. class into a regular class during the 1977-78 school year. Responses to this question were as follows:

Number of Pupils Integrated Part time	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample	Number of Pupils Integrated Part time	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
0	13	17.1	7	5	6.6
1	7	9.2	9	5	6.6
2	6	7.9	10	4	5.3
3	7	9.2	11	2	2.6
4	8	10.5	12	3	3.9
5	9	11.8	15	2	2.6
6	3	3.9	21	1	1.3
			29	1	1.3

Mean - 5.17

Standard Deviation 5.137

The size of the standard deviation is indicative of the wide variance in the responses to this question.

The respondents were asked to indicate the total number of E.D. students integrated *full time* from their E.D. class into a regular class during the 1977-78 school year. Responses to this question were as follows:

Number of Pupils Integrated Full-Time	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
0	49	64.5
1	10	13.2
2	9	11.8
3	2	2.6
4	1	1.3
5	1	1.3
6	1	1.3
14	2	2.6
15	1	1.3

Mean - 1.211

Standard Deviation 2.936

It should be noted that in response to this question most respondents (64.5%) indicated that no students had been integrated *full time* from their E.D. program back into regular classroom during the 1977-78 school year.

Referral to more or less Restrictive E.D. Programs

The respondents were asked to indicate the total number of their students during the 1977-78 school year referred to a *more restrictive E.D. program*. A more restrictive E.D. program was defined as a "... program characterized by a smaller teacher-pupil ratio and less emphasis on inclusion

in regular education programming." The results from this question were as follows:

Number of Pupils Referred to More Restrictive E.D. Program	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
0	40	52.6
1	15	19.7
2	11	14.5
3	4	5.3
4	4	5.3
5	1	1.3
6	1	1.3

Mean - 1.0

Standard Deviation 1.386

It is important to note that although the mean response to this question was 1.0, the most frequent response (52.6%) was 0.

The respondents were asked to indicate the total number of their students during the 1977-78 school year referred to a *less restrictive E.D. program.* A less restrictive E.D. program was defined as a "...program characterized by a higher pupil-teacher ratio and more emphasis on inclusion in regular education programming." The results were as follows:

Number of Pupils Referred to Less Restrictive E.D. Program	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
0	64	84.2
1	7	9.2
2	2	2.6

3	1	1.3
9	1	1.3
11	1	1.3

Mean - .447

Standard Deviation - 1.676

The vast majority of respondents (84.2%) indicated that no students had been referred to a less restrictive E.D. programming during the 1977-78 school year.

Referral to other types of Special Education Programs.

Respondents were asked the total number of students referred to learning disability classes, mental disability classes and multi-disability classes.

Results were as follows:

Referred to Learning Disability Programs	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
0	64	84.2
1	8	10.4
2	4	5.3
Total	76	100.0

Mean - .211

Standard Deviation - .524

Referred to Mental Disability Programs	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
0	60	78.9
1	11	14.5
2	4	5.3
3	1	1.3
Total	76	100.0

Nean - .289

Standard Deviation - .629

Referred to Multi-Disability Programs	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent of Sample
0	70	92.1
1	5	6.6
3	1	1.3

Mean - .105

Standard Deviation - .419

The results of this study indicated that few students were referred from E.D. programs into other types of special education programs during the 1977-78 school year

Length of time in programs prior to Integration

Respondents were asked the total length of time, in school months, each student who had been integrated from their program had been enrolled in an E.D. program. Data from this question indicated that a total of 301 pupils had been integrated (full or part time) during the 1977-78 school year. Results were as follows:

Length of Time in E.D. Program	Number of Pupils	Percent of Total Number Integrated
Three months or less	52	17.3%
4-6 months	71	23.6%
7-9 months	70	23.3%
10-12 months	31	10.3%
13-15 months	17	5.7%
15-18 months	27	9.0%
More than 18 months	33	11.0%

From the results of this question, it appears that the likelihood of a particular pupil being integrated decreases in relation to the length of time such a pupil has been placed in an E.D. program. Of those pupils who had been integrated during the 1977-78 school year 64.2% had been in an E.D. program for nine months or less.

DETERMINING READINESS OF PUPILS

Respondents were asked to check the particular criteria used with their E.D. program in determining the readiness of a student for integration. They were also asked to rate, using the following scale, the actual usefulness or importance of each item checked.

1. - of no importance
2. - of slight importance
3. - important
4. - very important

The frequency of the various items, as well as the average rating given, were as follows. The number in parenthesis, following each column, indicates the rank order of each item according to each criteria.

Item	Number of Subjects Rating Item (Rank)	Average Rating (Rank)
E.D. teacher's subjective evaluation: e.g. "I think he's ready"	72 (1)	3.125 (12)
Behavioral progress in E.D. classroom	71 (2)	3.775 (1)
Informal behavior observations (e.g. observation, brief notes)	70 (3)	3.514 (4)
Social progress with peers	69 (4)	3.536 (3)
Behavioral progress outside E.D. classroom	65 (5.5)	3.738 (2)
Academic Evaluation	65 (5.5)	3.0 (15)
Social progress with E.D. teacher	64 (7)	3.406 (6)
Social progress with other adults	63 (8.5)	3.429 (5)
Academic functioning level	63 (8.5)	3.175 (11)

Progress on daily assignment	62 (10.5)	3.403 (7)
Written goals and objectives (I.E.P.)	*62 (10.5)*	*3.113 (13)*
Teacher made behavior ratings	58 (12)	3.310 (9)
Study time habits	54 (13)	3.278 (10)
Anecdotal records	53 (14)	2.887 (17)
Psychological evaluation	49 (15)	3.061 (14)
Student self-evaluation	44 (16)	2.977 (16)
Formal behavior observations (e.g. behavior counts)	43 (17)	3.349 (8)
Standardized behavior ratings	33 (18)	2.485 (19)
Teacher made self-concept inventory	27 (19.5)	2.556 (18)
Sociometric devices	27 (19.5)	2.037 (21)
Standardized self-concept inventory	23 (21)	2.043 (20)

Using either the criteria of number of subjects checking a particular item or average rating given an item by respondents, it is interesting to note that the more subjective criteria such as "teacher's subjective evaluation", "behavioral progress" or "informal behavior observations" were consistently rated more frequently and higher than more objective items such as "formal behavior observations" or "written goals and objectives". On the basis of these responses it appears that the most frequently used and valued criteria in determining the readiness of an E.D. pupil to leave an E.D. program and return to a regular classroom rests with the perceptions of an individual E.D. teacher regarding student progress.

PLANNING/PROCEDURES IN INTEGRATION PROCESS

In response to the question "Are procedures for integration from your program into the regular classroom clearly defined?", twenty-six or 34.2% of the respondents answered yes and 50 or 65.8% of the respondents answered no. Respondents were also asked whether a pupil accounting system (numbers of students served, type of service provided, length of time served) that is systematic in nature was a part of their integration system. To this question 27 or 35.5% responded yes and 49 or 64.5% responded negatively.

Respondents were also asked questions regarding whether time was allotted in their schedules to plan integrations, whether in-service training was provided to regular class teachers before integration of E.D. pupils and whether there was a clarification of responsibilities between the E.D. and regular class teacher concerning integration. The responses to these questions were as follows:

Is time allowed in the E.D. teacher's day for planning integration?

	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
Yes	23	30.3
No	53	69.7

Is in-service training provided for regular classroom teachers before regular integration of E.D. students occurs?

	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
Yes	10	13.2
No	66	86.8

Is there clarification of responsibilities between the E.D. and regular classroom teacher concerning integration?

	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
Yes	39	51.3
No	37	48.7

It is interesting to note that the only question receiving a majority (51.3%)of positive responses was that question dealing with a working understanding between E.D. and regular classroom teachers regarding integration responsibilities. This appears to be the case despite the lack of time allowed for the E.D. teacher to work on this process and the lack of in-service opportunities being provided to regular classroom teachers.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the professional who is given primary responsibility for coordinating integration efforts. The collective response to this question, in order descending from most frequently checked, is as follows:

	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
E.D. Teacher	47	61.8
E.D. Consultant	3	3.9
Counselor	1	1.3
Principal	1	1.3
No one assigned	1	1.3
Multiple assignment	17	22.4
No response	6	7.9

Respondents were then asked to indicate those who were involved in the decision to initiate integration of an individual student. Regarding the number of people involved, the results were as follows:

Number Involved	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
0	7	9.2
1	3	3.9
3	6	7.9
4	10	13.2
5	12	15.8
6	13	17.1
7	12	15.8
8	9	11.8
9	4	5.3
Total	76	100.0

Mean - 5.145

Mode - 6.0

Standard Deviation - 2.480

Below is a listing of the professionals involved with integration with the percentage of respondents indicating the involvement of each type of person.

	Percent
E.D. Teacher	90.8
Regular Classroom Teacher	69.7
Principal	63.2
Parents	56.6
Student	53.9

E.D. Consultant	53.9
Psychologist	48.7
Social Worker	30.3
Counselor	25.0
Mental Health Personnel	7.9
Outside School	3.9
Special Education Director	2.6

VARIABLES INVOLVED IN SELECTION OF INTEGRATION SITE

Selection of a School

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had a choice of school in which to integrate a student. If so, they were asked to rate on a scale from 1 through 4 the importance of several variables related to the choice of school. The scale was as follows:

1 - no importance

2 - of slight importance

3 - important

4 - very important

The results of these questions were as follows:

"Is there a choice of school in which to integrate a student?"

	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
Yes	22	28.9
No	54	71.1

Considerations in Selection of School : (N=22)

Factor	Mean Rating
Support of services available	3.739
Attitude of school personnel toward integration	3.727
Organizational structure of classrooms	3.556
Opportunity for a "new start" for student	3.409

Philosophy of school	3.389
Geographical location	3.056

From this data it appears that in those few cases (28.9%) in which there is an opportunity to choose from more than one attendance center to begin integration, that factors such as support services and attitudes are considered the more important variables in making such a decision.

Selection of a classroom

Using the same scale as above, respondents were asked to indicate whether they had a choice of classroom into which to integrate a student and if so the importance assigned to various variables. The results were as follows:

"Is there a choice of classrooms in which to integrate a student?"

	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
Yes	68	89.5
No	8	10.5

The mean number of variables checked as important from the below list was 4.987 with 7 being the most frequent response.

Considerations in selection of classroom: (N=68)

Factor	Mean Rating
Teacher characteristics	3.766
Group dynamics (e.g. empathy and tolerance level of students, peer regard, number of students with problems)	3.618
Classroom structure	3.617

Academic achievement level in the classroom	3.306
Curriculum (e.g. academic orientation, affective components)	3.280
Number of students in the classroom	3.089

The vast majority (89.5%) of the respondents indicated that they did have the choice of a classroom into which to integrate a student with "teacher characteristics" being noted as the most important consideration in such a decision.

Selection of a Teacher

Respondents were asked to indicate whether there was a choice of a teacher with whom to integrate an E.D. student and if so the importance assigned to variables in the selection of such a teacher. The results were as follows:

"Is there a choice of the selection of a teacher with which to integrate the E.D. student?"

	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
Yes	63	82.19
No	13	17.1

The mean number of variables checked was 7.829 with 12 being the most frequent number (mode). The frequency of the various items, as well as the average rating given were as follows. The number in parenthesis, following each column, indicates the rank order of each item according to each criteria.

Item	Number of Subjects Rating Item (Rank)	Average Rating (Rank)
Teacher's rapport with student	60(1.5)	3.65(1)
Teacher's attitude toward integration	60(1.5)	3.583(2)
Teacher's personality	60(1.5)	3.533(4)
Teacher's academic expectations	59(4)	3.288(7)
Teacher's behavioral expectations	58(5)	3.569(3)
Teacher's willingness to be involved in planning for integration	52(6)	3.423(6)
Teacher's willingness to modify curriculum	49(7)	3.49(5)
Teacher's proficiency in use of behavior management techniques	44(8)	3.227(8)
Teacher's knowledge of exceptional students	43(9)	3.023(10)
Teacher's rapport with educators	39(10)	3.051(9)
Teacher's educational philosophy	38(11)	3.0(11)
Teacher's proficiency in use of precision teaching techniques	31(12)	2.742(12)

From the results of this item it appears that the respondents consider personality characteristics of the regular education teacher to be more important than factors such as knowledge of exceptional students or educational philosophy. The most important factors, on the basis of number of respondents rating items and average rating, were characteristics such as rapport with students, attitude toward integration and personality.

METHODS AND FOLLOW-UP OF INTEGRATION ACTIVITIES

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the following methods they use to integrate E.D. students. The responses, in order of frequency noted, were as follows:

	N	Percent
E.D. student attends regular class in one or more subjects	57	75%
E.D. student attends regular class for half a day, every day	24	31.6%
E.D. student attends regular class full day, every day	15	19.7%
E.D. student attends regular class for the full day, every other day	7	1.3%

From the results of this item it appears that the methods used to integrate E.D. pupils are predominately of a gradual integration model. Only 21% of the respondents indicated that pupils began integration by attending regular class on a full day basis. Rather, most integration activities were oriented toward a gradual return of the E.D. student to the regular education program.

Integration Follow-up

The respondents were asked to indicate the total number of persons involved with integration follow-up. Their responses indicated that one person is generally given this responsibility. These persons, listed according to most frequently noted, were as follows:

Person	Frequency (Number of Respondents)	Percent
E.D. Teacher	36	47.4%
E.D. Consultant	18	23.7%
Psychologist	7	9.2%
Regular Classroom Teacher	7	9.2%
Principal	5	6.6%
Counselor	4	5.3%

Twenty-four or 28.9% of the respondents indicated that no one is assigned this responsibility. Respondents were also asked to check the particular items which are components of their E.D. program's follow-up procedure following E.D. program termination. They were also asked to rate, using the following scale, the importance of each item checked.

1 - of no importance

2 - of slight importance

3 - important

4 - very important

The frequency of the various items, as well as the average rating given, were as follows. The number in parenthesis, following each column, indicates the rank order of each item according to each criteria.

Item	Number of Subjects Rating Item (Rank)	Average Rating (Rank)
Report from the receiving teacher	45(1)	3.756(1)
Report from the student (feelings toward regular class)	40(2.5)	3.525(4)
Academic progress in the regular class	40(2.5)	3.25(5)

Peer relations within the regular class	37(4)	3.622(2)
Behavior observation in the regular class	32(5)	3.531(3)
Report from the student's parents	30(6)	3.233(6)
Observation of study habits in regular class	27(7)	3.185(8)
Report from the E.D. consultant	25(8)	3.2(7)
Report from the receiving principal	17(9)	3.059(9)

From the results of this item it appears that reports from the receiving regular education teacher are the most frequent and most important means of following up pupils who leave an E.D. program.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that although a relatively high number of emotionally disabled pupils were partially integrated into regular classroom from special programs during the 1977-78 school year, most teachers (64.5%) indicated that no students had been fully reintegrated into regular classrooms during this period. Regarding movement into less or more restrictive E.D. programs along a continuum of program options, relatively few pupils were involved in this process. Still fewer students moved into other types of special education programs.

A number of factors would seem to contribute to this somewhat dismal picture. First, it appears that the E.D. teacher has primary responsibility to coordinate integration efforts, is more likely than any other professional to be involved in this process and is given primary responsibility for follow-up. Yet, most of these teachers indicated that procedures for integration were not clearly defined, that a systematic pupil accounting system was not in place, that time is not allowed in their day for planning integration, and that in-service training for regular classroom teachers is not usually provided. In addition, it appears from this study that these teachers primarily use more subjective measures in determining an individual child's readiness to return to the regular classroom.

In selecting the regular classroom or teacher to be involved in the integration process most respondents indicated that humane, attitudinal, and personality factors were more highly valued than knowledge of techniques or educational philosophies of these regular education teachers.

Finally, it seems that direct contact from the receiving teacher is the primary mode of integration follow-up.

The implications of this study should be obvious. As Grosenick (1970) has stated, "One of the most important objectives of special education programs for emotionally disturbed children is to return them to regular education programs."(p. 113) Yet, at least in the present study, such movement does not appear to be occurring at the rate we would desire. And a number of factors cited above would appear to contribute to this placement stagnation. Among the more obvious implications are (1) the need to provide in-service training and release time to classroom E.D. teachers for this process, (2) the need for further in-service to regular educators and administrators regarding the procedures involved and the importance of this process, (3) the need to involve more support personnel such as school psychologists in this process and (4) the need to provide further in-service training in the use of more objective measures for the planning of movement of youngsters back into the mainstream. This last point is similar to the research findings in generalization (Walker & Buckley, 1972; Wahler, 1969; and Gruber, 1971) which have noted the need for systematic maintenance strategies in order for newly acquired behaviors to generalize from one setting to another.

There is a need for further studies in the area of reintegration of behaviorally deviant children. As pointed out earlier, the present study is descriptive in nature and no attempt was made to experimentally manipulate those variables which may be crucial in this process. In addition,

the data for this study was taken from self-reports from classroom teachers of the emotionally disabled. Other studies combining teacher report data with pupil record review and objective observational data would certainly appear to be valuable.

Although some more seriously involved emotionally disabled pupils may face long-term services in a special class, the results of this study are disturbing in noting the general lack of movement of pupils from self contained and integrated models once these students have been placed in such a program. It is this writer's hope that professionals will take note of these preliminary findings and initiate efforts to improve the success rate of reintegrating emotionally disabled pupils.

REFERENCES

Arreola v. Board of Education. As cited in Ross, DeYoung & Cohen. Confrontation: special education and the law. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 5-12.

Covarrubias v. San Diego Unified School District. As cited in Ross, DeYoung & Cohen, 1971.

Deno, Evelyn. Special education as developmental capitol. Exceptional Children, 37, 3, 1970, 229-237.

Diana v. State Board of Education. As cited in Ross, DeYoung & Cohen, 1971.

Dunn, L.M. Special education for the mildly retarded - is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 5-22.

Grosenick, Judith K. Assessing the reintegration of exceptional children into regular classes. Teaching Exceptional Children, Spring, 1970, 2, 113-119.

Gruber, R. P. Behavior therapy: problems in generalization. Behavior Therapy, 1971, 2, 361-368.

Hobson v. Hansen, 269 F. Supp. 401 (D.C., 1967).

Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Rules of Special Education, Division of Special Education, 1977.

Morse, W.C., Cutler, R.L. & Fink, A.H. Public School Classes for the Emotionally Handicapped: A Research Analysis, Washington, D.C.: CEC, NEA, 1964.

Reutter, E.E. & Hamilton, R.R. The Law of Public Education. Mineola, New York: The Foundation Press, 1970.

Rhodes, William C. Beyond abnormality: into the mainstream. In Mainstreaming Emotionally Disturbed Children, Pappanikou & Paul (Eds.). Syracuse University Press: Syracuse, New York. 1977, 31-42.

Smith, C. Trends in programming for emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils. Iowa Perspective, Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Division of Special Education, April, 1978.

Spangler v. Board of Education, 311 F. Supp. 501 (1970).

Sparks, H.L. & Blackman, L.S. What is special about special education revisited: the mentally retarded. Exceptional Children, 1965, 31, 242-247.

Stark, W. & Bentzen, F. Integrating the emotionally disturbed child in the school. In Long, Morse and Newman (eds.) Conflict in the Classroom, Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Pub., 1971, 286-293.

Stone, T.E. Organizing and Operating Special Classes for Emotionally Disturbed Elementary School Children, West Nyack, New York: Parker Pub., 1971

Wahler, R.G. Setting generality: some specific and general effects of child behavior therapy. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2, 4, 239-246.

Walker, H.M. & Buckley, N.K. Programming generalization and maintenance of treatment effects across time and across settings. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1972, 5, 3, 209-224.

West, Douglas. Personal communication, 1977.

APPENDIX

A

Instrument Used In Data Collection

Refer to the following definitions as necessary when completing the questionnaire.

Special class with integration - an educational program for children requiring special education with similar educational needs who are enrolled in a special education classroom but who can profit from participation in one or more academic subjects with pupils who are not handicapped. Weighted index factor is 1.7. Maximum class size for elementary program is 12, for secondary 15.

Self-contained special class -an education program serving pupils with similar special education needs to the degree that they require special education instruction on a full time basis. Weighted index factor is 2.0. Maximum class size is 8 for elementary, secondary 10.

Self-contained special class - severe - an educational programming serving severely handicapped pupils with similar special education needs to the degree that they require special education instruction on a full time basis. Weighted index factor is 4.2. Maximum class size is 5 for elementary and secondary.

Integration - the participation of a special education pupil in any area of regular educational programming in addition to lunch room and playground.

More restrictive ED program - program characterized by smaller teacher-pupil ratio and less emphasis on inclusion in regular education programming.

Less restrictive ED program - program characterized by higher pupil-teacher ratio and more emphasis on inclusion in regular education programming.

A SURVEY OF CRITERIA AND METHODS USED IN INTEGRATION OF EMOTIONALLY DISABLED STUDENTS

SE-EMOT-1

1. Attendance center _____
   School district _____

2. Teacher's name _____

3. Check the number of years you have been an ED teacher.
   _____0-1 _____4-5
   _____2-3 _____6 or more

4. Type of ED program
   _____special class with integration-SCI (1.7)
   _____self-contained class SCC (2.0)
   _____self-contained-severe (4.2)

5. School placement of students in your ED class. (Check all that are appropriate)
   _____K-3 (primary) _____7-9 (junior high)
   _____4-6 (intermediate) _____10-12 (senior high)

6. Total number of ED students served by you throughout the school year.
   _____1977-78 school year

7. Total number of ED students integrated part-time from your ED class into a regular class.
   _____1977-78 school year

8. Total number of ED students integrated full-time from your ED class into a regular class.
   _____1977-78 school year

9. Total number of your students referred to a more restrictive ED program.
   _____1977-78 school year

10. Total number of your students referred to a less restrictive ED program.
    _____1977-78 school year

11. Total number of your students referred to another special class.
    _____learning disability class _____multi-disability class
    _____mental disability class _____other _____

12. Length of time each student integrated from your ED class was enrolled in an ED program. (school months) Check the appropriate time for each student.
    _____3 months or less _____10-12 months
    _____4-6 months _____13-15 months
    _____7-9 months _____15-18 months
    _____more than 18 months

PRE-INTEGRATION: DETERMINING READINESS OF STUDENT

Place a check if the following criteria are used in your ED program to determine readiness of the student for integration. Rate according to the actual usefulness or importance of each item checked. Rate only items checked, according to the following scale.

1--of no importance
2--of slight importance
3--important
4--very important

_____academic evaluation	1 2 3 4
_____psychological evaluation	1 2 3 4
_____standardized behavior ratings	1 2 3 4
_____teacher made behavior ratings	1 2 3 4
_____student self-evaluation	1 2 3 4
_____sociometric devices	1 2 3 4
_____written goals and objectives (IEP)	1 2 3 4
_____standardized self-concept inventory	1 2 3 4
_____teacher made self-concept inventory	1 2 3 4
_____formal behavior observations (e.g. behavior counts)	1 2 3 4
_____informal behavior observations (e.g. observation, brief notes)	1 2 3 4
_____academic functioning level	1 2 3 4
_____anecdotal records	1 2 3 4
_____study time habits	1 2 3 4
_____progress on daily assignments	1 2 3 4
_____behavioral progress in ED classroom	1 2 3 4
_____behavioral progress outside ED classroom	1 2 3 4
_____social progress with peers	1 2 3 4
_____social progress with ED teacher	1 2 3 4
_____social progress with other adults	1 2 3 4
_____ED teacher's subjective avaluation: e.g. "I think he's ready"	1 2 3 4
_____other (specify) _____	1 2 3 4

INTEGRATION

1. Are procedures for integration from your program into the regular classroom clearly defined?
   _____ yes _____ no

2. Is a pupil accounting system that is systematic in nature incorporated into your integration system? e.g. numbers of students served, type of service provided, length of time service was provided.
   _____ yes _____ no

3. Is time allowed in the ED teacher's day for planning integration?
   _____ yes _____ no

4. Is in-service training provided for regular classroom teachers before integration of ED students occurs?
   _____ yes _____ no

5. Is there clarification of responsibilities between the ED and regular class teacher concerning integration?
   _____ yes _____ no

6. Which person involved with the ED program is given primary responsibility for coordinating integration efforts?
   _____ED teacher
   _____ED consultant
   _____psychologist
   _____principal
   _____counselor
   _____Special Education Director
   _____social worker
   _____no one is assigned this responsibility
   _____other (specify) _____

7. Check those who are involved in the decision to initiate integration of an ED student from your program into the regular classroom.
   _____ED teacher
   _____ED consultant
   _____psychologist
   _____principal
   _____social worker
   _____mental health personnel
   _____outside school
   _____Special Education Director
   _____ED student
   _____ED student's parents
   _____counselor
   _____regular class teacher
   _____other (specify) _____

Place a check beside the following items that are currently considerations in your ED program's integration procedure. Rate the importance of only items you check.

1--no importance
2--of slight importance
3--important
4--very important

Selection of the school

Is there a choice of school in which to integrate a student?
_____yes _____no

If yes, considerations in selection of the school are:

_____geographical location	1 2 3 4
_____philosophy of school (IGE, traditional)	1 2 3 4
_____support of services available	1 2 3 4
_____organizational structure of classrooms (open, self-contained, etc.)	1 2 3 4
_____attitude of school personnel toward integration	1 2 3 4
_____opportunity for a "new start" for student	1 2 3 4
_____other (specify) _____	1 2 3 4

Selection of the classroom

Is there a choice of classrooms in which to integrate a student?
_____ yes _____ no

If yes, consideration in the selection of the classroom are:

_____number of students in the classroom	1 2 3 4
_____classroom structure	1 2 3 4
_____academic achievement level in the classroom	1 2 3 4
_____availability of aides or volunteers	1 2 3 4
_____group dynamics (e.g. empathy and tolerance level of students, peer regard, number of students with problems)	1 2 3 4
_____curriculum (e.g. academic orientation, affective components)	1 2 3 4
_____teacher characteristics	1 2 3 4
_____other (specify) _____	1 2 3 4

Selection of the teacher

Is there a choice in the selection of a teacher with which to integrate the ED student?

_____ yes _____ no

If yes, consideration in selection of the regular class teacher are:

_____teacher attitude toward integration	1 2 3 4
_____teacher proficiency in use of behavior management techniques	1 2 3 4
_____teacher proficiency in use of precision teaching techniques	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's willingness to be involved in planning for integration	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's educational philosophy	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's personality	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's academic expectations	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's behavioral expectations	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's willingness to modify currivulum	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's rapport with students	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's rapport with educators	1 2 3 4
_____teacher's knowledge of exceptional students	1 2 3 4
_____other (specify) _____	1 2 3 4

METHODS OF INTEGRATING ED STUDENTS

Which of the following methods do you use? Check those which apply.

_____ED student attends regular class in one or more subjects.
_____ED student attends regular class for half a day, every day.
_____ED student attends regular class for the full day, every other day.
_____ED student attends regular class full day, every day.
_____other (specify) _____

INTEGRATION FOLLOW-UP

Who in your ED program is given primary responsibility for follow-up of the ED student integrated into the regular class following ED program termination?

_____ED teacher
_____ED consultant
_____psychologist
_____no one is assigned this responsibility
_____counselor
_____principal
_____Special Education Director
_____social worker
_____regular class teacher
_____other (specify)_____

1--of no importance
2--of slight importance
3--important
4--very important

Place a check beside the following items which are components of your ED programs integration follow-up procedure following ED program termination. Rate the importance of only the items you check.

_____report from the receiving teacher	1 2 3 4
_____report from the receiving principal	1 2 3 4
_____report from the ED consultant	1 2 3 4
_____report from the student (feelings toward regular class)	1 2 3 4
_____report from the student's parents	1 2 3 4
_____behavior observation in the regular class	1 2 3 4
_____observation of study habits in regular class	1 2 3 4
_____academic progress in the regular class	1 2 3 4
_____peer relation within the regular class	1 2 3 4
_____other (specify) _____	1 2 3 4